

Appl. No. 10/821,212
Amdt. dated April 17, 2006

REMARKS

It has been noted that claim 20 follows claim 19, both of which are directed to a printer, but claim 20 depends from method claim 15. The dependency is in error. Claim 20 should depend from allowed claim 19.

The amendment makes claim 20 dependent on allowed claim 19, and, therefore, claim 20 is also submitted to be allowable.


Also, the amendment to page 4 cures an obvious typographical error.

Entry of the amendment would place the application in better condition for appeal.

Although allowed dependent claim 30 was cancelled along with parent claim 29 and claim 30 was rewritten as independent claim 31, the Examiner's response dated March 29, 2006 is silent as to claim 31. A statement that claim 31 has been allowed is requested.

Also, please provide any translation which the Patent and Trademark Office has as previously requested or state that this request cannot or will not be honored.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph J. Grass
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 19,768

Date: April 17, 2006
Dayton, OH
(937) 865-2012